

**Carstens,
Yee &
Cahoon, L.L.P.**

13760 Noel Road
Suite 900
Dallas, Texas 75240

Main No. (972) 367-2001
Facsimile (972) 367-2002

Facsimile Cover Sheet

To: Assistant Commissioner of Patents for Examiner Examiner Benjamin R. Bruckart Group Art Unit 2155	Facsimile No.: (703) 746-6568
From: Amy Miller Legal Assistant to Kevin Goodsell	No. of Pages Including Cover Sheet: 3
<p>Message:</p> <p>Examiner Bruckart,</p> <p>Attached please find a copy of the Agenda for the below referenced application number that you requested per our telephone conversation.</p> <p>If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Thanks so much,</p> <p>Amy</p>	
Re: Application No 09/692,394 Attorney Docket No: AUS9-2000-0398-US1	
Date: Monday, February 16, 2004	
Please contact us at (972) 367-2001 if you do not receive all pages indicated above or experience any difficulty in receiving this facsimile.	<i>This Facsimile is intended only for the use of the addressee and, if the addressee is a client or their agent, contains privileged and confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this facsimile, you have received this facsimile inadvertently and in error. Any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying is strictly prohibited. If you received this facsimile in error, please notify us by telephone and return the facsimile to us immediately.</i>

Agenda For Telephone Conference With Examiner

I. Overview of Invention

II. Overview of Prior Art of Record

III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102

1. Rogers does not teach the feature of communicating through a firewall using a simulation of a browser as recited in independent claims 1, 9, 18, 26, 30 and 31

- 1.1 Rogers teaches presenting data located on different databases using an actual browser, not a simulated browser.

agents simulate

- 1.2 Furthermore, it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Rogers to reach the features of the presently claimed invention. Rogers does not address the same problems as the presently claimed invention. The claimed invention is directed to a mechanism for communicating through a firewall using a simulation of a browser. Rogers is not concerned with communication through a firewall. To the contrary, Rogers is directed to a system that allows web users to request information that is created by a data interpretation system and then presented by a web server to the user of the web.

col 9 24-28

2. Stern does not teach instructions to simulate a browser in a data processing system in which the browser being simulated is able to communicate through a firewall and communicate with a host directly instead of using the browser as recited in independent claim 13.

*Java enabled
network
device →*

*Fig 5.6
7-proxy*

- 2.1 Stern teaches a system for providing a network interface device which allows a secure representation of network services to a host computer. There is nothing in Stern that has anything to do with simulating a browser to communicate through a firewall
- 2.2 Furthermore, it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Stern to reach the features of the presently claimed invention. Stern is directed to an entirely different problem than the present invention. Stern is concerned with implementing network security with a network interface device. Conversely, the presently claimed invention is concerned with simulating a browser to communicate through a firewall.